

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/677,155	10/01/2003	Hui-Chuan Hung	67,200-1114	8165
7590 01/14/2005			EXAMINER	
TUNG & ASSOCIATES			NGUYEN, JIMMY	
Suite 120			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
838 W. Long Lake Road			ARTONII	FATER NOMBER
Bloomfield Hill	s, MI 48302	2829		

DATE MAILED: 01/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

e/i -		Application No.	Applicant(s)		
Office Action Summary		10/677,155	HUNG, HUI-CHUAN		
		Examiner	Art Unit		
		Jimmy Nguyen	2829		
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication a	ppears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address		
A SH THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. It period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a replayer of the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	1. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tile ply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day and will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from ute, cause the application to become ABANDONE	mely filed ys will be considered timely. n the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status					
1)🖂	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>01</u>	October 2003.			
2a)□	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.				
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposit	ion of Claims				
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1 - 20 is/are pending in the applicate 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withded Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1 - 20 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	rawn from consideration.			
Applicat	ion Papers				
10)	The specification is objected to by the Exami The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) and applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the oath or declaration is objected to by the	ccepted or b) objected to by the ne drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se ection is required if the drawing(s) is objected.	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). ojected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
12)□ a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Bure See the attached detailed Office action for a li	ents have been received. Ents have been received in Applicate ionity documents have been receive au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No red in this National Stage		
Attachmen	(t(s)				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)					
2) Notice 2) Information	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 er No(s)/Mail Date <u>1003</u> .	Paper No(s)/Mail D			

Application/Control Number: 10/677,155

Art Unit: 2829

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1 - 4, 9 - 11 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Navratil et al (US 6777964).

As to claim 1, Navratil et al disclose (fig 7) an apparatus for electrically testing a Microelectronic product comprising:

an electrical test head (102) to which is mated a microelectronic product (104) for electrically testing the microelectronic product (104); and

movable electrical probe tip (110) positioned with respect to the electrical test head (102) such as to electrically stress a portion the microelectronic product other than an electrical contact portion of the microelectronic product.

As to claims 2 - 4, 10, 11, Navratil et al disclose (fig 7) an apparatus of claim 1 wherein the microelectronic product (104) is semiconductor product, ceramic substrate and optoelectronic product.

Application/Control Number: 10/677,155

Art Unit: 2829

As to claims 9, 16, Navratil et al disclose (fig 7) an method for electrically testing a microelectronic product comprising:

an electrical test head (102) to which is mated a microelectronic product (104) for electrically testing the microelectronic product (104); and

movable electrical probe tip (110) positioned with respect to the electrical test head (102) such as to electrically stress a portion the microelectronic product other than an electrical contact portion of the microelectronic product

sequentially movably positioning the electrical probe tip (110) and electrically biasing the microelectronic product while simultaneously electrically testing the microelectronic product.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 5, 12, 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Navratil et al (US 6777964).
 - As to claims 5, 12, 17, Navratil et al disclose (fig 7) everything except for a controller to control the position of the probe tip. However, the controller which:

Application/Control Number: 10/677,155

Art Unit: 2829

controls electrical probe tip positioning and biasing with respect to the portion of the microelectronic product other than the electrical contact portion of the microelectronic product; an simultaneously collects corresponding electrical test data from the microelectronic product is obvious disclosed in figure 7, the electrical probe (110) is connected to tester (not shown, throughout the cable).

It would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was make to provide the tester or controller within the testing system for the purpose of the controlling and transmitting the testing signal.

5. Claims 6 - 8, 13 - 15, 18 - 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Navratil et al (US 6777964) in view of Kitahata (US 6686753).

As to claims 6, 13, 18, Navratil et al disclose (fig 7) all the limitation of the apparatus of claim 1. However, Navratil et al are silent on radiation beam source positioned with respect to the electrical probe tip such as to simultaneously radiation stress the portion of the microelectronic product other than the electrical contact portion of the microelectronic product.

On the other hand, Kitahata teaches (fig 3) radiation beam source (11) positioned with respect to the electrical probe tip (6) such as to simultaneously radiation stress the portion of the microelectronic product other than the electrical contact portion of the microelectronic product.

Art Unit: 2829

It would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was make to modify the testing system with the beam source for the purpose of the testing the device optically.

As to claims 7, 8, 14, 15, 19, 20, Kitahata discloses (fig 3) the apparatus of claim 6 wherein the electrical probe tip and the radiation beam source are on the same side or opposite side of the microelectronic product (22). (column 2 lines 52 – 55).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jimmy Nguyen at (703) 306-5858. Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4900.

JN. Jan 7, 2005

DAVID ZARNEKE